



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

better palaestra for limbering up the vocabulary and strengthening the grip on Latin thought through the phrase-group than is to be found in the nervous, rapid, picturesque style of Seneca. The rhetorical artifices do, indeed, tend to pall; but the modernness and intrinsic value of the thought, when this author is read in moderation in careful selections, greatly lessen any feeling of lassitude.

Dr. Bell has provided adequate material for characterizing Seneca the stylist, the philosopher, the man of letters, and the interpreter of his time. The selections include *Ad Polybium de Consolatione*, the *Apocolocyntosis*, the two books *Ad Neronem de Clementia*, and ten of the *Epistulae Morales*. The general introduction, pp. ix-xxxiv, like the whole book, is modest and unpretentious. After reading it one feels as if he had just shaken hands with Seneca, not made his acquaintance.

As might have been expected from an editor who had already published the *Apocolocyntosis* as a monograph, the notes on that satire are more numerous, ample, learned and also more sparkling than is the case with the more perfunctorily annotated essays. In several places the editor has improved upon the notes in his monograph (e. g. 6.1 *Marci municipem*; 7.1 *ubi mures ferrum rodunt*). Though the notes in the monograph have been much condensed there are still two pages of notes to one of text, while the scale for the rest of the book is less than page for page. Without denying its diverting qualities, one might well feel dubious lest the rollicking 'Pumpkinification' of the late lamented Claudius might blur the outlines of Seneca's more serious literary work in the impression left on the student's mind.

As many readers of the *Ad Polybium de Consolatione* will probably have also read Sulpicius's letter to Cicero on the death of Tullia, and the several consolatory epistles of Pliny, some discussion of the genre would have been welcome (cf. Buresch, *Consolationum a Graecis Romanisque scriptarum historia critica*, *Leipziger Studien* 9). Yet in a work of such brevity some omissions are necessary. The notes seem on the whole uneven, affording ample aid for translation rather than deep insight into the writer's thought and style. Some may cavil at an occasional flippancy met with more often in the class-room than in a school edition—*ma chacun à son gout*. Dr. Ball and the editor of the series deserve only thanks for having provided so well printed and convenient a text of Seneca for our younger college students.

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY.

GEORGE DWIGHT KELLOGG.

CORRESPONDENCE

The delightful article by Dr. Riess in *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 3.138-140 suggests certain more or less pertinent questions. It may be true that "nothing will be well done but what is gladly done and our

boys do not love their Latin". Would Dr. Riess be more successful in finding boys who love their mathematics or their science? Few boys display any such interest in the mathematics electives available for them in the upper grades of High School, while the science courses elective in the second and third years are very meagerly attended—a cogent commentary on the confident expectation entertained a few years ago by scientific enthusiasts who predicted the speedy disappearance of the Classics from our schools to make way for physics and chemistry.

Would it not be nearer the truth to say that the average boy does not and cannot be expected to love any task? Smooth ice in winter and a swimming pool in summer look far better to him than a school room. Yet the average boy knows that life cannot be all play and applies himself to his task, perhaps not "gladly" but resignedly. Of course there is a certain type of boy, a little below the average who brings himself into prominence through his noisy protest against his studies. He does not like Latin or any other subject, with whose difficulties he has become acquainted, and he raises such a din in our ears that we forget the uncomplaining majority. Were it possible to secure from the student body of any large classical school an unbiased expression of feeling as to what subject they—perhaps we had better not say love most—dislike least, does Dr. Riess seriously believe that a majority of pupils would prefer mathematics to Classics?

Few of us will be disposed to quarrel with Dr. Riess on one point. Our first year work is certainly a severe strain on the beginner. Little effort is made to make the first year work interesting, or to find any points of contact between what the pupil has learned in the elementary school and what he is set to learn in the High School. The little the boy knows of geography and history might conceivably be utilized in a proper scheme for first year instruction. Professor Sonnenschein's *Ora Maritima* and *Pro Patria* are notable steps in this direction.

There is grave reason to doubt whether pupils could be made to take anything like a lively interest in Roman life at the beginners' stage of mental development. Such a manual as Dr. Riess suggests, modeled on the lines of Gurlitt's *Fibel*, could be adapted to the American boy only with much more difficulty than that requisite to adapt it to the European lad, whose native atmosphere and country's history present many points of contact with Rome.

In view of the fact that Caesar has in spite of the recommendations of the Committee of Ten been adopted with practical unanimity throughout this country as the second year book, are we wise in opposing the tendency to shape our first year work specifically towards a preparation for Caesar? As we are face to face with "a condition and not a theory", may we not more profitably address ourselves to the problem of making the best of the situation by trying to make a Caesar beginning book reasonably interesting?

That little in that direction has been done in current publications is indisputable. Are we on that account to conclude that nothing can be done? Then there is the problem of vocabulary. If we are to read Caesar in the second year, the vocabulary of the first year must be rather rigidly restricted to those words most frequently occurring in the Commentaries. How such a vocabulary can be made available to the purpose of a reconstructed Gurlitt's *Fibel* is not clear to my mind.

BOYS HIGH SCHOOL, Brooklyn.

W. A. JENNER.